PREVELANCE OF FECAL PARASITES IN FIELD STUDIES OF COCKATIELS AND BUDGERIGARS IN LAYYAH AND JHANG- PAKISTAN

Muhammad Fiaz Qamar^{1*}, Tahir Hussain¹, Iram Liaqat², Madiha Kiran¹and Muhammad Ameeq³

¹Department of Pathobiology, University of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, Lahore sub-campus Jhang-35200, Pakistan

²Department of Zoology, Government College University, Lahore-54000, Pakistan

³Department of Statistics, Government Higher Secondary School Sinawan, Pakistan

Corresponding Author: fiaz.qamar@uvas.edu.pk

ABSTRACT: Parrots are from the order (Psittaciformes) that are found all over the world globally. Parrots are of different types and different subtypes; are reared at home, fanciers and at the farm level for business point of view. It is the loveliest bird due to its beautiful colors and voice to attract the people. The objective of this study was to find out the presence of parasitic oocysts in the parrots cockatiels (Nymphicus hollandicus) and budgerigars (Melopsittacus undulates) through different laboratory procedures. The incidence of the cockatiels birds positive for the coccidiosis in Layyah found was (120/170) 70.5% and for Capillaria was (30/120) 17.6% while, mixed infection (Eimeria spp. + Capillaria spp.) prevalence was (20/120) 11.7%. The incidence of budgerigars Layyah parrots observed was (80/90) 89% for coccidiosis and for Capillaria was (10/90) 11% and no mixed infection (Eimeria spp. + Capillaria spp.) was reported in the present study. Prevalence of the cockatiel and budgerigar identified for the parasite diagnosis in Jhang; both showed positive for the coccidian only and the prevalence of coccidiosis in cockatiels was (20/120) 100% and in the budgerigars was (120/120) 100%. EPG counted through McMaster slide for the Coccidia was 750, while the EPG for Capillaria was 700 in both cases of cockatiels and budgerigars of Layyah and EPG counted through McMaster slide for the coccidian in both species of parrots was same in the both districts that showed very weak burden of the parasites.

This study identified the parasitic loads in two cities of both parrot species. This study recommends for the proper management and deworming strategies against these parasites of both parrot species in these two cities to get rid of the parasitic burden to prevent other bird species in the region. The incidence of this study would be further identified by molecular characterization.

Key words: Parrot, Cockatiel, Eimeria spp., Capillaria spp., fecal examination, Molecular characterization

INTRODUCTION:

The zoos are the places where a lot of the bird species are kept in the captivity that are threatened or near to extinct. Birds are protected under this environment and can breed easily. So, these birds are not only saved from visitor induced stress but also spreading of pathogens from local and nonmigratory bird species [1). But, Parasites are also the main disturbing factor of ecological balance [2, 3] in the predatory birds that have great role in the food web [4]. Parrots are the common fancy game birds that are found in the ecosystem all over the world [5]. Parrots are not only affected by the parasites but also are the main cause of economic losses. These parasites consume nutrients and vitamins resulting the decreased feed utilization, intestinal obstruction and toxins production in the host [6]. Parasites are considered to cause little or no distress to healthy wild birds. But, parasitic infections are the significant cleanliness problems for the captive birds in highly dense areas. So, parasites are the main cause of serious health issues or even deaths that are newly kept in the captivity or adopted into new environment [7].

Birds could be parasitized by a wide variety of endoparasites i.e. nematodes, trematodes, cestodes, acanthocephalans, and protozoa and it is important to identify and control parasite species capable of producing diseases in captive birds. Severe infections of endoparasites in birds significantly cause droopiness, loss of weight and diarrhea [8]. Dorrestein [9] reported that parasitic infestations i.e. protozoans, blood parasites and helminthes are the common issues of aviary populations. Sakas [10] reported the tapeworms were common in finches, cockatoo and eclectus parrots and also identified that coccidiosis was a serious threat against the budgerigars and in aviary birds and shown significant mortality. Gonzalez-Hein [11] also reported that intestinal nematodes such as Ascoropes sp. and capilaria spp are the main causes of aviary. Prathipa [12] identified ascardia sp and capillaria sp in budgericar, african love bird and cockatiel. Endoparasitic infection is common in birds kept in captivity. Parasites are considered as the main cause of coevolutive parasite-host relationship as captive bred birds may be significantly are the main cause of the transmission of parasites towards the other animals kept in the same area [13]. Therefore, surveys are considered baseline to know the disease outbreaks and epidemiological studies [14]. This study was done to find out the presence of fecal parasitic oocysts in the parrots species cockatiels (Nymphicus hollandicus) and budgerigars (Melopsittacus undulates) through different laboratory methods.

Materials and methods

Sample collection

Fresh fecal samples of the 560 parrots (Cockatiels and Budgreigar) were collected from the local markets and home fanciers of the Jhang and Layyah districts through manual method in the plastic bags.

Laboratory diagnostic techniques

All the samples were examined through direct smear, sedimentation and floatation methods.

Direct smear examination

In this method, ten ml Normal Saline was mixed with 0.5g of feces and the solution was filtered through a sieve to remove the debris. Then, the two drops of the filtrate was placed on the glass slide and covered with a coverslip after making the thin smear that was examined under the microscope for the detection of parasitic oocysts [15]. The positive samples were further examined by direct smear examination, sedimentation and floatation methods.

Sedimentation technique

The samples that were positive for the direct smear examination were further identified by Sedimentation method. In this method, three grams of the fecal samples were mixed in the distilled water and sieved. Centrifugation of the filtrate was performed at 1500 rpm for 2 minutes. The supernatant was discarded and a drop of sediment was placed on the glass slide and parasitic oocysts were detected under the microscope [16].

Flotation technique

The samples that were positive for the direct smear and sedimentation methods were examined through [17].

McMaster counting Technique

EPG (eggs per gram) in fecal samples were measured through the McMaster method as proposed by [18].

Statistical Analysis:

Statistical analysis was done through Quantitative Parasitology (QPweb) software Version 1.0.10. The percentage of prevalence, mean intensity and mean abundance following the statistical methods was described by [19]. Measures of infection are presented in Table 1.

RESULTS

We observed 250 cockatiels and 100 budgreigars birds from the Layyah district. Prevalence of the parasites identified in the both parrot species was one protozoan (Eimeria spp.) and one Helminth (Capillaria spp.). The parrots were parasitized with the coccidian spp the most as compared to Capillaria spp. Prevalence of the bird positive for the coccidiosis in Layyah was found (120/170) 70.5% and for Capillaria was (30/120) 17.6% in Lavyah Cockatiel species and mixed infection (Eimeria spp. + Capillaria spp.) prevalence was (20/120) 11.7% in Layyah cockatiels also identified as shown in Table 1. The incidence of budgerigars Lavyah parrots showed was (80/90) 89% for coccidiosis and for Capillaria was (10/90) 11% and no mixed infection (Eimeria spp. + Capillaria spp.) was reported in the present study of Budgreigars parrots of Layyah. Prevalence of the cockatiel and budgerigar identified for the parasite diagnosis in Jhang; both showed positive for the coccidian only. But, the prevalence of coccidiosis in cockatiels was (210/210) 100% and in the budgerigars was (120/120) 100% and no other parasite was reported in the present study at jhang district for two species of parrots.

EPG counted through McMaster slide for the *Coccidia* was 750, while the EPG for *Capillaria* was 700 in both cases of cockatiels and budgerigars of Layyah and EPG counted through McMaster slide for the *Coccidia* was 750 in both cases of cockatiels and budgerigars of Jhang.

Table 1. Measures of Fecal Parasites (preval-	ence, mean intensity and mean ab	oundance) stratified by Parrots sampled
---	----------------------------------	---

Birds Species	Parasite Species	Total infected Birds	Infected Birds	Not Infected Bird	% Prevalence Infected bird	Mean Intensity	Mean abundance
Layyah	Eimeria	170	120	30	70.5	1.41	0.6
	Cappilaria		30		17.6	5.67	0.15
	Mixed Infection		20		11.7	8.5	0.1
Budgerigars	Eimeria	90	80	10	89	1.12	0.8
	Capillaria		10		11	9	0.1
Cockatiels	Eimeria	210	210	40	100	1	0.84
Budgerigars	Eimeria	120	120	30	100	1	0.8
	Birds Species Cockatiels Budgerigars Cockatiels Budgerigars	Birds SpeciesParasite SpeciesBirds SpeciesEimeriaCockatielsEimeriaMixed InfectionInfectionBudgerigarsEimeriaCockatielsEimeriaBudgerigarsEimeria	Birds SpeciesTotal infected SpeciesBirds SpeciesParasite Speciesinfected BirdsCockatielsEimeria Infection170BudgerigarsEimeria Capillaria90CockatielsEimeria Infection210BudgerigarsEimeria120	Birds SpeciesParasite SpeciesTotal infected BirdsInfected BirdsBirds SpeciesEimeria120CockatielsCappilaria Infection17030BudgerigarsEimeria Capillaria9080CockatielsEimeria 1021010CockatielsEimeria210210BudgerigarsEimeria120120	Birds SpeciesParasite SpeciesTotal infected BirdsInfected BirdsNot Infected BirdsCockatielsEimeria (Cappilaria) Mixed Infection1703030BudgerigarsEimeria (Capillaria)908010BudgerigarsEimeria (Capillaria)21040BudgerigarsEimeria21021040BudgerigarsEimeria12012030	$ \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Birds Species} \\ \mbox{Birds Species} \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Total} \\ \mbox{infected} \\ \mbox{Birds} \\ \mbox{Birds} \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Not} \\ \mbox{Infected} \\ \mbox{Birds} \\ \mbox{Birds} \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Not} \\ \mbox{Infected} \\ \mbox{Birds} \\ \mbox{Birds} \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Not} \\ \mbox{Infected} \\ \mbox{Birds} \\ \mbox{Birds} \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Not} \\ \mbox{Infected} \\ \mbox{Infected} \\ \mbox{Infected} \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Not} \\ \mbox{Infected} \\ \mbox{Infected} \\ \mbox{Infected} \\ \mbox{Infector} \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Not} \\ \mbox{Infected} \\ \mbox{Infected} \\ \mbox{Infector} \\ \mbox{Infector} \\ \mbox{Infector} \\ \mbox{Infector} \\ \mbox{Infector} \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Not} \\ \mbox{Infected} \\ \mbox{Infector} \\ \mbox$	$ \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Birds Species} \\ \mbox{Birds Species} \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Total} \\ \mbox{infected} \\ \mbox{Birds} \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Infected} \\ \mbox{Birds} \\ \mbox{Birds} \\ \mbox{Birds} \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Not} \\ \mbox{Infected} \\ \mbox{Birds} \\ \mbox{Birds} \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Not} \\ \mbox{Infected} \\ \mbox{Birds} \\ \mbox{Birds} \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Not} \\ \mbox{Infected} \\ \mbox{Birds} \\ \mbox{Birds} \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Not} \\ \mbox{Infected} \\ \mbox{Birds} \\ \mbox{Birds} \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Not} \\ \mbox{Infected} \\ \mbox{Infected} \\ \mbox{Infected} \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Not} \\ \mbox{Infected} \\ \mbox{Infected} \\ \mbox{Infected} \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Not} \\ \mbox{Infected} \\ \mbox{Infected} \\ \mbox{Infected} \\ \mbox{Infected} \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Not} \\ \mbox{Infected} \\ In$

• %Prevalence-(no. of infected birds/total no. of birds examined (infected and non-infected)×100

• Mean intensity-total no. of parasites within infected host/total no. of infected birds with that parasite

• Mean abundance-total no. of individual parasites in infected host/total no. of hosts examined (infected and non-infected)

DISCUSSION

Most poultry birds are subjected under the hygienic environmental conditions and vaccination against the different harmful diseases as these are bred in the controlled houses or in the captivity. But, parrots have no vaccination available against the harmful infections and these are bred in the open houses and they have no proper hygienic conditions in the captive environment. So, these factors have the great involvement for the harmful diseases in parrots as compared to the other poultry or captive birds. There are different endoparasites of parrots i.e. *nematodes, cestodes,* and *protozoa* that are involved in the low production of eggs, less growth and mortalities of the birds. Different techniques are involved for the proper diagnosis of parasites in the birds.

But, the fecal examination is the most probable method for the detection of parasites incidence in the birds. Previous researchers have reported the endoparasites that are co-related with the present study as incidence in 11.1–51.9% of zoo birds in Turkey [20], from 48.1% to 71.4% in India [21,22], 51.6% in Spain [23], and in 22.5% of pet birds in Japan [24]. Eimeria and Isospora infections were also reported in Passeriformes and Psittaciformes [25,26]. This study is also related with the findings of [27] as he conducted a study in 2005 and 2011, a total of 10,356 faecal samples of different avian species were determined. He reported that Coccidia (mainly Eimeria spp./Isospora spp./Caryospora SDD.). Capillaria spp., ascarids (mainly Ascaridia spp./Porrocaecum spp.), Heterakis spp., Trichostronyglus spp. and Amidostomum spp. were the most frequently identified parasites. Very less prevalence of coccidia; But the prevalence of *capillaria* was the same as identified by [1] as he determined the endoparasites in zoological gardens in

Serbia conducted during 2015 and 2016 from 318 individual birds belonging to 112 species and diagnosed 7 different parasites and the prevalence of *coccidia* and *capillaria* reported was in the ranges between 8.33% and 32.84%, and 2.77% and 29.41% respectively. Sierra [28] diagnosed capillariosis with the prevalence of 100% in Falconidae, Psittacidae and Ramphastidae birds from the captive fauna center in Columbia. But this study has not supported the present study. Low prevalence of mixed infection with Syngamus and capillarids (0.7%) was found in the same peacock species from Italy [7] and this study also showed very low prevalence of capillaria than the present study results. The research conducted in India, Prathipa [29] diagnosed mixed infection with species from genera Capillaria, Ascaridia and Trichostrongylus in 60.78% of zoo birds of *Psittacidae* family and this study also not supported the present study results.

Patra [30] determined the prevalence of endoparasitic infections of birds in different zoological gardens in North-Eastern region of India that was investigated from February 2018 to January 2019 of 1,275 fecal samples from 10 different species of captive birds. The overall prevalence of helminths found was 29.25%. With that, coccidian oocysts, eggs of *Capillaria spp, Ascaridia spp, Heterakis spp, Raillietina tetragona, R. cesticillus, Echinostoma spp, Strongyloides avium, Dispharynx spp*, eggs of unidentified trematode and co-infections with more than one species were recorded from some Zoological gardens. This study correlated with the present study as coccidian was the most prevalent parasite in different species.

Papini [7] collected faecal samples individually from pet (n =63) and zoo (n = 83) birds representing 14 orders and 63 species. Overall, 35.6% of the birds harboured parasites (42.2% of zoo birds and 27% of pet birds), including Strongyles-Capillarids (8.9%), Ascaridia (6.8%), Strongyles (5.5%), G. duodenalis Assemblage A (5.3%), Coccidia (4.1%), Cryptosporidium (4%), Porrocaecum (2.7%), Porrocaecum-Capillarids (2%), and Syngamus-Capillarids (0.7%). This study has not supported the present study results; as very less prevalence was identified in this study than the present study. Cunha [13] reported endoparasites in faecal samples from cracids (curassows and allies) bred in captivity at the Parque Dois Irmãos, Recife, and Pernambuco state in Brazil. The results obtained were positive for Strongyloides sp., Ascaridia sp., Capillaria sp. and cysts of Entamoeba coli.

Marietto-Gonçalves [31] reported that coccidia were the commonest parasites in their analyses on birds. However, it is worth pointing out that in that study 95.45% of the samples testing positive came from Passeriformes. This study has supported the present study results as very high prevalence was identified in this study like the present study results. Eggs of Capillaria sp. have also been recorded in the faeces of the orders *Galliformes* and *Passeriformes* [31] that supports our study results.

The present study revealed the parrots cockatiels (*Nymphicus hollandicus*) and budgerigars (*Melopsittacus undulates*) infected with different types of endoparasites. Mixed infections were also seen in examined cockatiels parrots of layyah district. This was a preliminary study for identification

and prevalence of parasites in parrots. The prevalence of these infections in parrots would be better identified by further extended molecular studies. Necessary prevention and control programs should be implemented to reduce the risk of parrots to get rid of infection. Furthermore, proper management practices and public awareness strategies should be adopted to stop the spread of pathogens from parrots to other livestock and humans.

REFERENCES:

- [1] Ilić, T., Becskei, Z., Gajić, B., Özvegy, J., Stepanović, P., Nenadović, K., & Dimitrijević, S. (2018). Prevalence of endoparasitic infections of birds in zoo gardens in Serbia. *Acta parasitologica*, 63(1), 134-146. <u>https://doi.org/10.1515/ap-2018-0015</u>
- [2] Zhao, T., Guo, Y.-N., Zhang, L.-P., & Li, L. (2016). Ultrastructure of Ascaridia galli (Schrank, 1788)(Nematoda: Ascaridida) from the endangered green peafowl Pavo muticus Linnaeus (Galliformes: Phasianidae). Acta parasitologica, 61(1), 66-73. https://doi.org/10.1515/ap-2016-0007
- [3] Núñez, V., Drago, F. B., Digiani, M. C., & Lunaschi, L. I. (2017). Nematode parasites of the Chilean Flamingo, Phoenicopterus chilensis (Phoenicopteridae) from Central Argentina, with a description of a new species of Tetrameres (Tetrameridae). *Acta parasitologica*, 62(2), 422-431. <u>https://doi.org/10.1515/ap-2017-0050</u>
- [4] Víchová, B., Reiterová, K., Špilovská, S., Blaňarová, L., Hurníková, Z., & Turčeková, L. (2016). Molecular screening for bacteria and protozoa in great cormorants (Phalacrocorax carbo sinensis) nesting in Slovakia, central Europe. Acta parasitologica, 61(3), 585-589. https://doi.org/10.1515/ap-2016-0078
- [5] Darrel, K. (1996). Antimicrobials commonly used in avian medicine Part 4: Antifungals, anthelmintics, and antiprotozoals. Old World Aviaries Antimicrobial. Hill Country Aviaries L LC, 33-34.
- [6] Khan, M., Khan, M., Shafee, M., & Khan, J. (2010). Prevalence and chemotherapy of helminthiasis in parrots at Lahore Zoo, Pakistan. J. Anim. Plant Sci, 20, 189-192. J. Anim. Pl. Sci. 20(3): 2010
- [7] Papini, R., Girivetto, M., Marangi, M., Mancianti, F., & Giangaspero, A. (2012). Endoparasite infections in pet and zoo birds in Italy. *The scientific world journal*, 2012. <u>https://doi.org/10.1100/2012/253127</u>
- [8] Saranya, K., Prathaban, S., Senthilkumar, K., Srithar, A., & Gomathinayagam, S. (2017). Incidence of endoparasite and protozoal infection in captive wild birds. *Int J Sci Environ Technol*, 6(5), 2911-2920.
- [9] Dorrestein, G. M. (2003). Diagnostic approaches and management of diseases in captive passerines. Paper presented at the Seminars in Avian and Exotic Pet Medicine. <u>https://doi.org/10.1053/saep.2003.127881</u>
- [10] Sakas, P. S. (2002). Understanding avian laboratory tests. *Essentials avian Med a Guid Pract*, 1-10.
- [11] González-Hein, G., Fredes, F., Kinsella, M., Larenas, J., & González-Acuña, D. (2012). New reports of helminthes in captive exotic psittacine birds in Chile. *Archivos de Medicina Veterinaria*, 44(1), 87-91. Arch Med Vet 44, 87-91 (2012)

- [12] Prathipa, A., Jayathangaraj, M., Gomathinayagam, S., & Thangavelu, A. (2013a). Endoparasites of Captive Psittacine Birds in Major Zoos in India. <u>http://krishikosh.egranth.ac.in/handle/1/71471</u>
- [13] Cunha, A., Mendonça, F., Oliveira, R., Baratella-Evencio, L., Oliveira-Filho, R., Simões, R., . . . Evêncio-Neto, J. (2008). Prevalence of endoparasites in faecal samples of cracids bred in captivity at the Parque Dois Irmãos, Recife, Pernambuco, Brazil. Acta Veterinaria Brno, 77(3), 387-392. https://doi.org/10.2754/avb200877030387
- [14] Stone, E. G., Montiel-Parra, G., & Pérez, T. M. (2005). A survey of selected parasitic and viral pathogens in four species of Mexican parrots, Amazona autumnalis, Amazona oratrix, Amazona viridigenalis, and Rhynchopsitta pachyrhyncha. *Journal of zoo and wildlife medicine*, 245-249. <u>https://www.jstor.org/stable/20096446</u>
- [15] Greiner, E. C. (1989). Parasite diagnosis by fecal examination. Journal of the Association of Avian Veterinarians, 3(2), 69-72. <u>https://doi.org/10.2307/30134907</u>
- [16] Latif, A. A., Fazal, S., Manzoor, F., Maqbool, A., Asghar, S., Wajid, I., & Ashraf, A. (2016). A comparative study on prevalence of coccidian parasites in broiler chicken (Gallus gallus domesticus), Japanese quail (Coturnix coturnix japonica) and wild pigeon (Columba livia). *Pakistan Journal of Zoology*, 48(1). Pakistan J. Zool., vol. 48(1), pp. 295-297, 2016.
- [17] Faust, E., DAntoni, J., & Odom, V. (1938). Miller MJ, Peres C, Sawitz W, Thomen LF, Tobie J, Walker JH. A critical study of clinical laboratory technics for the diagnosis of protozoan cystis and helminth eggs in faecespreliminary communication. *American Journal of Tropical Medicine*, 18, 169-183.
- [18] Foreyt, W. J. (2013). *Veterinary parasitology reference manual*: John Wiley & Sons.
- [19] Rózsa, L., Reiczigel, J., & Majoros, G. (2000). Quantifying parasites in samples of hosts. *Journal of* parasitology, 86(2), 228-232. <u>https://doi.org/10.1645/0022-</u> 3395(2000)086[0228:QPISOH]2.0.CO;2
- [20] Gurler, A. T., Beyhan, Y. E., Acici, M., Bolukbas, C. S., & Umur, S. (2010). Helminths of mammals and birds at the Samsun Zoological Garden, Turkey. *Journal of zoo* and wildlife medicine, 41(2), 218-223. <u>https://doi.org/10.1638/2009-0070R1.1</u>
- [21] Patel, P., Patel, A., Sahu, R., & Vyas, R. (2000). Prevalence of gastrointestinal parasites in captive birds of Gujarat zoos. *Zoos' Print Journal*, 15, 295-296.
- [22] Parsani, H., Momin, R., & Bhuva, C. (2001). Parasitic infections among captive birds at Sakkarbagh zoo, Junagadh, Gujarat. *Zoos' Print Journal*, 16(4), 462-464.

- [23] Cordón, G. P., Prados, A. H., Romero, D., Moreno, M. S., Pontes, A., Osuna, A., & Rosales, M. (2009). Intestinal and haematic parasitism in the birds of the Almuñecar (Granada, Spain) ornithological garden. *Veterinary parasitology*, 165(3-4), 361-366. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetpar.2009.07.027
- [24] TSAI, S.-S., HIRAI, K., & ITAKURA, C. (1992). Histopathological survey of protozoa, helminths and acarids of imported and local psittacine and passerine birds in Japan. *Japanese Journal of Veterinary Research*, 40(4), 161-174. <u>https://doi.org/10.14943/jjvr.40.4.161</u>
- [25] Friend, M., Franson, J. C., & Ciganovich, E. A. (1999). Field manual of wildlife diseases: general field procedures and diseases of birds: US Geological Survey.
- [26] Atkinson, C. T., Thomas, N. J., & Hunter, D. B. (2009). *Parasitic diseases of wild birds*: John Wiley & Sons.
- [27] Globokar, M., Fischer, D., & Pantchev, N. (2017). Occurrence of endoparasites in captive birds between 2005 to 2011 as determined by faecal flotation and review of literature. *Berliner und Münchener tierärztliche Wochenschrift, 130*(11/12), 461-473. <u>http://vetline.de/open-access/</u>
- [28] Sierra C.M., Ramírez F.G., Osorio H.J. 2013. Principale helmintosen contrados en uncentro de fauna cautiva en Columbia. Boetin Científico Centro de Museos Museo de Historia Natural, 17, 251–257
- [29] Prathipa, A., Jayathangaraj, M., Gomathinayagam, S., & Thangavelu, A. (2013b). Prevalence of endoparasites in captive psittacine birds belonging to pet shops and private residences in and around Chennai. *International Journal of Veterinary Science*, 2(2), 58-60.
- [30] Patra, G., Efimova, M., Sahara, A., Al-Abodi, H., Borthakur, S., Ghosh, S., . . . Debbarma, A. (2021). Prevalence of endoparasitic fauna of various species of birds in North-Eastern region of India. *Biological Rhythm Research*, 52(6), 882-894. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/09291016.2019.1608725</u>
- [31] Marietto-Gonçalves, G. A., Martins, T. F., de Lima, E. T., de Souza Lopes, R., & Andreatti Filho, R. L. (2009). Prevalência de endoparasitas em amostras fecais de aves silvestres e exóticas examinadas no Laboratório de Ornitopatologia e no Laboratório de Enfermidades Parasitárias da FMVZ-UNESP/Botucatu-SP. *Ciência Animal Brasileira*, 10(1), 349-354. <u>https://www.revistas.ufg.br/vet/article/view/1300</u>